



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/558,570	04/26/2000	Todd A. Kuiken	P1308USA	9521

8968 7590 02/26/2003

PATENT DOCKET DEPARTMENT
GARDNER CARTON & DOUGLAS LLC
191 N. WACKER DRIVE, SUITE 3700
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER	
SNOW, BRUCE EDWARD	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3738	

DATE MAILED: 02/26/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/558,570

Applicant(s)

KUIKEN, TODD A. *AK*

Examiner

Bruce E Snow

Art Unit

3738

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 December 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4-22 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

Election/Restrictions

Claims 10 and 18-19 are now withdrawn from prosecution. Claims 4-22 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in Paper No. 6.

It is noted that the elected species 1 does not comprise an additional spring element. Claims having this limitation, i.e. claims 4-7, were indicated by applicant as non-elected claims in paper No. 6.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.


The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Art Unit: 3738

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wilkinson (6,053,946).

Wilkinson teaches a prosthetic foot comprising an L-shaped frame 72 having a first and second axis, such as the longitudinal axis of portion 76; a connector 94 which is adapted to rotate about the said axis; and a footplate 90. See all embodiments including that shown in figure 11.

Claims 1, 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wilson (5,116,384).

 Wilson teaches a prosthetic foot comprising an L-shaped frame including element 48 and, inherently, a prosthetic leg element (not shown, see column 3, lines 67-68) defining a first horizontal axis and second axis; a connector including element 20 which is adapted to rotate about the said first axis; a footplate 12; means for controlling the rotation includes elements 64, 66.

Claims 1, 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Phillips (6,206,934).

Phillips teaches a prosthetic foot comprising an L-shaped frame including element 14, 34 defining a first horizontal axis and second axis; a connector including element 16 which is adapted to rotate about the said first axis; a footplate 12; means for controlling the rotation includes elements 52, 53.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilkinson. Wilkinson discloses the invention as described above; however, is silent in regards to the materials used for the frame. It is well known in the art to utilize high strength polymer and composite material for any portion of a prosthetic foot and would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have utilized it for the foot of Wilkinson for its known strength and resiliency.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 12/16/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's explanation of the Wilkinson reference is generally correct, however, applicant failed to understand the limitations of claim 1. Claim 1 only requires that the connector is adapted to rotate about a "first axis" not that the connector rotates about an exterior surface of the frame. The same is true of the footplate. Wilkinson teaches a flexible prosthetic foot which includes a connector 94 and footplate that are adapted to flex about a longitudinal axis of the foot fulfilling all claim language. It is noted that applicant used different language in withdrawn claim 18, "*such that the*

Art Unit: 3738

connector may rotate about the frame" to better define the prosthesis; it is also noted that this claim was not rejected in view of Wilkinson.

The rejection in view of Wilson et al has been withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments regarding the Phillips rejection are not persuasive.

Applicant's understanding of Phillips device is generally correct. Phillips teaches a prosthetic foot comprising an L-shaped frame defining a first horizontal axis, wherein a connector is bonded between the frame and a footplate. All of the elements are made of resilient materials to store and release energy during walking. Because of the resilient materials of the frame, connector, and footplate, all are capable of rotating about an axis of a leg of the frame mimicking the natural foot/ankles ability to flex when walking on a canted surface.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 3738

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bruce E Snow whose telephone number is (703) 308-3255. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott can be reached on (703)308-2111. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-3590 for regular communications and (703) 305-3590 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0858.

bes
February 24, 2003



BRUCE SNOW
PRIMARY EXAMINER